

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15-18 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15-18 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 15-16 are independent. Applicants submit that pending claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15-18 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejections. Applicants traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

### **EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW**

We thank the Examiner for granting the Examiner's Interview on Friday, January 22, 2010. During the Interview, we discussed differences between the pending claims and the references cited in the Office Action.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101**

#### **I. Claims 13 and 15 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13 and 15 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that amended claims 13 and 15 are directed to patent eligible subject matter.

Under the "machine-or-transformation" test of *In Re Bilski* ("Bilski"), claimed subject matter is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 if "(1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing." Amended claims 13 and 15 recite systems comprising a virtual browser executing on a device intermediary to a plurality of clients and a plurality of web servers. Thus, the systems of claim 13 and 15 are tied to a particular machine and comprise statutory subject matter (see MPEP 2106.01, citing to *In Re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360-1361 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

Because claims 13 and 15 are directed to a particular machine, Applicants submit that claims 13 and 15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

#### **II. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15 were presented for examination. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0242145 filed by Krishnamurthy *et al.*, (“Krishnamurthy”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624 issued to Jamtgaard *et al.*, (“Jamtgaard”). Claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 15 are independent claims. Claims 4 and 5 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claim 12 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 11. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Krishnamurthy and Jamtgaard, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

#### **A. Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 15 Patentable over Krishnamurthy in view of Jamtgaard**

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Amended independent claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 18 recite methods and systems for efficiently parsing received files, such as data files, web pages, and HTML pages. The claims recite a virtual browser comparing a stored or cached version of a file (data file or HTML page) with a received file (data file or HTML page) to identify non-matching content in the received file and parsing the non-matching content to generate a subtree. Applicants submit that Krishnamurthy and Jamtgaard, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 16.

The combination of Krishnamurthy and Jamtgaard fails to teach or suggest a virtual browser that identifies non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content. The Examiner cites Krishnamurthy for the purpose of describing identifying non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content and Jamtgaard for the purpose of describing a virtual browser. Krishnamurthy requires transforming

an unstructured document into an abstract syntax tree prior to performing comparisons with a stored version of the page (*see* Krishnamurthy, para. [0080]) and parsing the entire received document instead of the non-matching content. Furthermore, Krishnamurthy teaches away from using the non-matching content by stating the approach described “does not find all differences between two files or documents, but rather ...find[s] the clip in the new document that best corresponds to the selected portions(s) in the first document” (*see* Krishnamurthy, para. [0067]). For at least these reasons, Krishnamurthy fail to teach or suggest identifying and parsing the non-matching content.

Additionally, the Examiner admits that Krishnamurthy does not teach or suggest a virtual browser and cites Jamtgaard only for the purpose of describing a virtual browser. Neither Krishnamurthy nor Jamtgaard describe a virtual browser executing on a device intermediary to a plurality of clients and a plurality of web servers identifying non-matching content of a received web page. Therefore, the combination of Krishnamurthy and Jamtgaard fails to teach or suggest a virtual browser that identifies non-matching content of a received web page and parses the non-matching content.

Because the combination of Krishnamurthy and Jamtgaard fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 15 are patentable and in condition for allowance. As claims 4-5 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of claim 1, and claim 12 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of claim 11, Applicants submit that claims 4-5 and 12 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### III. Claims 16-18 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Krishnamurthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,361 to Basani *et al.* (“Basani”). Claim 16 is independent. Claims 17-18 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 16. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that Krishnamurthy and Basani, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claim 16 Patentable over Krishnamurthy and Basani

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Amended independent claim 16 recites a method for efficiently parsing received data files where a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service compares a received web page to a stored cached webpage to identify non-matching content in the received web page. The virtual browser parses the non-matching content to generate a subtree and modifies the abstract syntax tree to comprise a token mapped to the subtree. Applicants submit that Krishnamurthy and Basani, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 16.

The combination of Krishnamurthy and Basani fails to teach or suggest a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service identifying non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content. The arguments made above with respect to Krishnamurthy apply with equal force here and are reiterated as if set forth in full. Therefore, Krishnamurthy fails to teach or suggest a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service that identifies non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content.

The Examiner cites Basani only for the purpose of describing “determining, by a service executing on a computing device, that a received webpage comprises an object not stored in cache.” As with Krishnamurthy, Basani fails to describe a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service identifying non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content. Similar to Krishnamurthy, Basani is silent with regards to a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service identifying non-matching content of a received web page. Thus, Basani fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Krishnamurthy. Therefore, the combination of Krishnamurthy and Basani fails to teach or suggest a virtual browser of a plurality of virtual browsers of a service that identifies non-matching content of a received web page and parsing the non-matching content.

Because the combination of Krishnamurthy and Basani fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 16 is patentable and in condition for allowance. As claims 17-18 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of claim 16, Applicants submit that claims 17-18 are also patentable

and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: January 27, 2010

/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna  
Registration No. 53,302  
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP  
Two International Place  
Boston, MA 02110  
Phone: (617) 248-5000  
Fax: (617) 502-5002